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**What Would You Do?**

**Directions: Read each of the following scenarios and determine whether or not:**

***• Is this type of action necessary in a time of war? If so, explain why?***

• ***If not, should someone be held responsible for these actions in a court of law? Explain why***

**Scenario #1**:

In a time of war, a naval commander for a European country orders his submarines to attack all ships, regardless of whether or not they are transporting civilians. His goal is to hit submarines that may be carrying weapons to his enemy. When one of his submarines DOES attack a ship that

(Answer: Nazi commander Karl Donitz was NOT found guilty of war crimes during WWII, but was found guilty of waging wars of aggression).

→**My Response**: I think the war is not necessary, because even at the end of the war, Nazi commander was not felt guilty as the crimes, but they actually guilty of the wars of aggression. So why should the war started at first of all? European country attack their enemies because their goal is to hit submarines that maybe carrying weapons to his enemy, which not a statement. Frist the problem is not stated yet, the commander think those weapon maybe to attack them, but I don’t think that is a good reason to started a war.

**Scenario #2**:

An eastern European country contains several ethnic groups. Groups from surrounding countries have lived in “Country A” for years. Due to ethnic tensions in the country, the leader of Country A begins a campaign to “rid” his country of these foreigners. He has burned their villages, arrested them without trial, and murdered many. Over 500,000 have fled Country A for safety. When outside intervened, several mass graves were discovered with thousands of bodies. It is estimated that 100,000 civilians are either missing or have been killed.

(Answer: This scenario represents the genocide in Kosovo in 1999 under Slobodan Milosevic.

He was charged with crimes against humanity, including murder, forcible transfer, and deportation

and "persecution on political, racial or religious grounds”, but died before the end of his trial.)

→**My Response**:

I think in this case is definitely not necessary; because it ends up 100,000 civilians were missing or dead. No matter what problems is going on between two countries or two sides, ending up killing millions and civilians paid off their lives that was not worthy. By the way, the action is only adding up on top of the war, they will discover even more bodies from mass graves. He was against humanity, murdered, forcible transfer and deportation, these all against the world, political, racial and religions.

**Scenario #3**:

In an effort to fight the “War on Terror”, a prison has been established for “persons of suspicion” to be detained for further questioning. Many of these prisoners are arrested and detained without arrest warrants and are not given the right to counsel (a lawyer). Yet, valuable information may result from questioning these suspects. In order to “extract” this information, the following tactics are used: pouring the phosphoric liquid on detainees; pouring cold water on naked detainees; beating detainees with a broom handle and a chair; frightening and intimidating detainees with threats of attack, and in one instance actually biting a detainee.

(Answer: The above scenario describes the conditions at Abu Ghraib during the Iraq War. While several U.S. soldiers have been brought to trial for their actions, many have been acquitted, dishonorably discharged, or are serving light sentences.)

→**My Response**:

I think in this case, an effort fight the “War on Terror.” I believe it is Okay to start war, somewhat I disagree to starting a war; but this case is about the persons of suspicions, and connected to the other prisoners. Pouring the phosphoric liquid on detainees; pouring cold water on naked detainees; beating detainees with a broom handle and a chair; frightening and intimidating detainees with threats of attack, and in one instance actually biting a detainee is actions that many people disagree, but that’s what they think of to attack the detainees.

**Scenario #4**:

You are a U.S. soldier. You have been assigned to fight in a jungle country. It is difficult to distinguish your enemy from everyday civilians. A recent attack on your company resulted in the death of a close friend. You have been asked to raid the homes of suspected enemies and confiscate weapons. You raid the homes, but find no weapons. You’re emotionally and physically exhausted. You take your frustration out on the villagers you have encountered. Before you know it, you and your fellow soldiers have burned the village to the ground and killed many of its civilians.

(Answer: The above scenario represents the My Lai Massacre during Vietnam. Only one man

was arrested for this incident and has since been pardoned.)

→My Response: In this case, I think the war is not necessary. Being understand that as soldier of the U.S that had lost a close friend, but raiding homes and find no weapons that suspicions other civilians. And we use weapons against others that seems not fair to them. The more important was that the outcome had burned the village and killed more people. In any case that outcome that did not solve the problem but just keep killing and increasing death rate count as unnecessary war.